

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7 and 8 remain pending in the present application. Claims 2, 3 and 6 have been cancelled. Claim 1 has been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Law, et al. newly cited. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 6 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 6 depended from Claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 6 and Claim 6 has been cancelled. Thus, Applicant believes Claim 1, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claim 4, which depends from Claim 1, is also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Claims 2 and 3 have been cancelled.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Law, et al. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Law, et al. in view of Ziegenfelder, newly cited. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Law, et al. in view of Ferng, newly cited. Claims 5, 7 and 8 ultimately depend from Claim 1. As stated above, Claim 1 has been amended and is now believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Thus, Claims 5, 7 and 8

are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 30, 2005

By: 

Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg